

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-15 and 17-28 are now in the application. Claims 1-15 and 17-28 are subject to examination. Claims 12 and 22 have been amended. Claim 29 has been canceled to facilitate prosecution of the instant application.

Under the heading “Claim Objections” on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 22 because of an informality.

The Examiner stated that “the packet-based exchange” lacks antecedent basis. Applicant appreciates the indication of the informality. The terms have been changed to “the packet-oriented exchange”.

Support for correcting the typographical error can be found by referring to the second limitation of previously presented claim 12 and to the specification at paragraph [0026], lines 10-19.

Under the heading “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103” on page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 12-15, 17, 18, 20 and 22-29 have been rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,182,750 to ales et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,026,290 to Lamkin et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The Examiner stated that claim 29 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The limitations of claim 29 have been added to claim 12. Claim 22 has also been similarly amended.

Support for the changes can be found by referring to claim 29, to Fig. 4 and to paragraph [0029], lines 10-26 of the specification.

It is believed that the invention as defined by claims 12 and 22 is not anticipated by or suggested by the prior art.

Under the heading “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103” on page 6 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 12 and 22 have been rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,359,880 to Curry et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,026,290 to Lamkin et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The invention as now defined by claims 12 and 22 would not have been suggested for the reasons given above.

Under the heading “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103” on page 7 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 19 has been rejected as being obvious unpatentable U.S. Patent No. 5,182,750 to Bales et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,026,290 to Lamkin et al and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,943,408 to Chen et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The invention as defined by claim 19 would not have been suggested for the reasons given above with regard to claim 12.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 8 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 21 has been rejected as being obvious unpatentable U.S. Patent No. 5,182,750 to Bales et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,026,290 to Lamkin et al and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,888,839 to Scoggins et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The invention as defined by claim 21 would not have been suggested for the reasons given above with regard to claim 12.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 12 or claim 22. Claims 12 and 22 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 12 or claim 22.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-15 and 17-28 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark P. Weichselbaum/
Mark P. Weichselbaum
(Reg. No. 43,248)

MPW:cgm

December 2, 2010

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101